

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

1. Rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as  
being unpatentable over Ishifuji et al (US 6,061,389, hereafter Ishifuji) in  
5 view of Mansfield (US 6,704,346).

**Response:**

The applicant would like to point out the patentable differences between  
independent claims 1 and 11 and the cited prior art references.

Claim 1 recites the limitations of:

“before the radio device changes frequencies from a current time  
slot to a next time slot the standby frequency channel parameters  
for the next time slot and the connection frequency channel  
15 parameters for the next time slot are stored in the first and second  
register sets respectively, such that when the link state of the radio  
device changes in the current time slot, the link state controller  
switches the multiplexer so that **the selected frequency  
parameters for the next time slot are loaded into the working  
20 register set in the current time slot.**”

Claim 11 recites the limitations of:

“**inputting the selected frequency channel parameters for the  
next time slot into the frequency channel controller in the  
25 current time slot** when the link state of the radio device changes  
in the current time slot for controlling the radio device during the  
next time slot.”

In short, claims 1 and 11 state that the selected frequency parameters for  
the next time slot are loaded into the working register set (which feeds the  
frequency channel controller) during the current time slot and before the next  
30

time slot starts.

As noted by the examiner on page 3 of the Office action dated 03/21/2008, Ishifuji does not disclose that “the link state controller switches the multiplexer according to the link state of the radio device for the next time slot so that certain frequency parameters are loaded into the working register set”; and “when the link state of the radio device changes in the current time slot the selected frequency parameters for the next time slot are loaded into the working register set in the current time slot”.

Mansfield teaches a way to look ahead to see which Bluetooth (BT) channel frequencies will soon be used. Mansfield teaches in Figure 5 that a modified frequency selection box 32 provides a "look-ahead" capability, or mechanism, which determines and stores, in a frequency storage mechanism 34, the next few "future channel frequencies" which are to be selected. Mansfield also teaches in Figure 7 that a shift register 76 stores frequency information for the current slot  $F_N$  as well as for the next 11 slots  $F_{N+1}$  to  $F_{N+11}$ .

However, Mansfield fails to teach that “the selected frequency parameters for the next time slot are loaded into the working register set in the current time slot”, as is recited in claims 1 and 11 of the instant application. Therefore, although Mansfield teaches that the shift register 76 stores frequency information for the current slot  $F_N$  and the next slot  $F_{N+1}$ , Mansfield does not teach loading the selected frequency parameters for the next time slot into the working register set **in the current time slot** when the link state of the radio device changes in the current time slot as is claimed.

For these reasons, the applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Ishifuji and Mansfield does not teach all of the claimed limitations contained in claims 1 and 11. Therefore, claims 1 and 11 are

patentable over the combination of Ishifuji and Mansfield.

Furthermore, claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, and 12 are dependent on claims 1 and 11, and should be allowed if claims 1 and 11 are allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, and 10-12 is therefore respectfully requested.

2. Rejection of claims 2, 5, 9, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 2, 5, 9, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishifuji and Mansfield in view of Belanger et al. (US 5,729,680).

**Response:**

Claims 2, 5, 9, and 13 are dependent on claims 1 and 11, and should be allowed if their respective base claims are allowed. Reconsideration of claims 2, 5, 9, and 13 is therefore respectfully requested.

3. Rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishifuji and Mansfield in view of Orava (US 6,829,288).

**Response:**

Claim 6 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claim 6 is therefore respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Appl. No. 10/065,585  
Amdt. dated April 11, 2008  
Reply to Office action of March 21, 2008

Sincerely yours,



Date: 04/11/2008

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

- 10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)